arXiv:1209.3383v1 [math.CA] 15 Sep 2012

A VARIATION NORM CARLESON THEOREM FOR VECTOR-VALUED WALSH-FOURIER SERIES

TUOMAS P. HYTÖNEN, MICHAEL T. LACEY, AND IOANNIS PARISSIS

Abstract. We prove a variation norm Carleson theorem for Walsh-Fourier series of functions with values in a UMD Banach space. Our only hypothesis on the Banach space is that it has finite tile-type, a notion introduced by Hytönen and Lacey. Given $q \in [2,\infty)$ we show that, if the space X has tile-type τ for all $\tau \in (q,\infty)$ then the r-variation of the Walsh-Fourier sums of any function $f \in L^p([0,1);X)$ belongs to L^p, whenever $q < r \leq \infty$ and $(r/(q-1))' < p < \infty$. We also show that if this conclusion is true for a variant of the variational Carleson operator then the space X necessarily has tile-type τ for all $\tau > q$. For intermediate spaces, i.e. spaces $X = [Y,H]_\theta$ which are complex interpolation spaces between some UMD space Y and a Hilbert space H, the tile-type is $q = 2/\theta$. We show that in this case the variation norm Carleson theorem remains true for all $r > q$ in the larger range $p > (2r/q)'$.

1. Introduction

The celebrated theorem of Carleson on the pointwise convergence of Fourier series, [5], asserts that the partial sums of the Fourier series of an L^p-function converge almost everywhere to the function for $1 < p < \infty$. The usual strategy to prove this result is to show that the *Carleson operator*, that is, the maximal partial sums of the Fourier series of a function, is bounded on the corresponding L^p-space. Subtle refinements of the Carleson theorem [8] involve more refined notions than the ℓ^∞-norm of the partial sums. One of these notions is the variation norm Carleson theorem, proved in [19], which in particular shows the pointwise convergence of the Fourier series of f without having to resort to a dense subset where this convergence can be easily exhibited. A weighted version of the corresponding result for Walsh-Fourier series has recently appeared in [10].

We point out that, in the scalar case, variational bounds for the Hilbert transform as well as for more general Calderón-Zygmund operators have been obtained for example in [3]

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 42B20 Secondary: 46E40 .

T.H. and I.P. are supported by the European Union through the ERC Starting Grant "Analytic-probabilistic methods for borderline singular integrals". T.H. is also supported by the Academy of Finland, grants 130166 and 133264 and I.P. also supported by the Academy of Finland, grant 138738.

M.L. supported in part by the NSF grant 0968499, and a grant from the Simons Foundation (#229596 to Michael Lacey).

and [4]. In [14] the authors study more singular operators such as averages along lower dimensional sets and truncations of singular integrals with rough kernels. However, there is no complete characterization of the Calderón-Zygmund kernels, say, that give rise to operators that obey variational bounds. The question is subtle since a variational bound immediately implies the pointwise converge of the truncations of singular integrals and it is known that this convergence fails for some operators. In the vector-valued setup the information is even scarcer. For example it is natural to ask whether the Hilbert transform of a function with values in a UMD Banach space obeys variational bounds. That would be the vector-valued analog of the main result in [14] and, to the best of our knowledge, it is not currently known.

The first results on Carleson's theorem for vector-valued functions appear in [24] and [23] with the additional hypothesis that the target Banach space X is a UMD space with an unconditional basis, or more generally, that it is a UMD lattice. The corresponding result for Walsh-Fourier series was proved for UMD lattices in [27]. Recently in [20], Parcet, Soria and Xu proved the "little Carleson theorem" in general UMD spaces, thus taking a step away from the lattice hypothesis. In this paper we take up the investigation initiated in [12] and continued in [11, 13], concerning the vector-valued extensions of Carleson's theorem and related issues, where the lattice assumption is completely avoided. In particular, this paper is very much in the spirit of [12] since we study the variant of Carleson's theorem, due to Billard [2], for Walsh-Fourier series.

In particular we prove a variation norm version of Carleson's theorem for Walsh-Fourier series of vector-valued functions in the spirit of [10, 19]. A necessary condition for this type of results is known to be that the target Banach space X has the UMD property: X-valued martingale differences converge unconditionally in the space. See for example [11, 23, 24]. Furthermore, a key hypothesis in this paper is the *tile-type* hypothesis, introduced in [12]. This is a hypothesis with a probabilistic flavor on the geometry of X, which is easily seen to be stronger than usual cotype, although we do not know at this moment if it is strictly stronger than the hypothesis of finite cotype together with the UMD property.

The tile-type hypothesis has been successfully used in [12] where it is shown that finite-tile type implies that the partial sums of Walsh-Fourier series converge to the function almost everywhere. Another hypothesis of similar flavor has been used in [11] to show the corresponding result in the trigonometric case. In these two works, the prototypical examples of UMD Banach spaces with finite tile-type are *the intermediate spaces* $X = [Y, H]_\theta$, that is, spaces X which are complex interpolation spaces between some UMD Banach space Y and a Hilbert space H. This class of Banach spaces includes for example all the UMD lattices but also the Schatten ideals C_p, $1 < p < \infty$, and in general all examples of UMD spaces that are currently known, which are not necessarily function lattices. However the tile-type turns out to be a qualitative hypothesis for the Carleson theorem: the exact value of the tile-type is irrelevant, it is only needed that it is finite. This changes dramatically when one looks at models for vector-valued bilinear Hilbert transforms, [13]. There the exact value of the tile-types of the Banach spaces involved play a crucial role in the range of inequalities one can prove, and in fact one needs to stay 'close enough' to the Hilbert space tile-type $q = 2$ to get *any* bounds on the Walsh model of the bilinear Hilbert transform[1].

The present paper, besides bringing another result in the vector-valued setup, has a different objective: to relate the tile-type of the Banach space to the boundedness of the Carleson operator in a quantitative manner. Although this is not possible in the usual formulation of the Carleson theorem, the variational variant gives the correct framework for such a quantification. Furthermore, in this setup, one can prove a partial converse. Roughly speaking we can show that if a variation norm version of the Carleson operator is bounded within a certain range of exponents then necessarily the target space X has finite tile-type whose exact value is directly related to the variation index. Thus the variation index, which can be viewed as a quantification of the rate of convergence of the partial Walsh-Fourier series, is intimately related to the tile-type of the UMD Banach space under consideration. The partial converse described above is a step towards characterizing the UMD Banach spaces for which Carleson's theorem is true. In particular we know that tile-type implies Carleson's theorem. However we now see that the tile type condition implies, and essentially characterizes, the validity of a variation norm Carleson theorem on a UMD Banach space. The question whether Carleson's theorem is valid on an arbitrary UMD Banach space remains open however. Our method and general strategy of proof is along the lines of [10, 12, 19], using the time-frequency analysis techniques and arguments introduced in [15].

The first thing we need to do in order to formulate our main results is to describe what is the variation norm of a sequence. This norm plays a central role throughout the paper.

Let $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ and $x = \{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of elements of a Banach space $(X, |\cdot|)$. The r-variation of the sequence x is defined as

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{V}^r(X)} := \sup_{K} \sup_{N_0<\cdots<N_K} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{K} |x_{N_j} - x_{N_{j-1}}|^r \Big)^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

with the usual modification when $r = \infty$. Observe that the $\mathcal{V}^\infty$-norm is essentially the ℓ^∞-norm. If $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of X-valued functions, $f_n : \mathbb{R}_+ \to X$, we will also write

$$\|f_n\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}_+;\mathcal{V}^r(X))} := \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \|f_n(x)\|^p_{\mathcal{V}^r(X)} dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

---

[1] There is another striking detail, that one can formulate vector-valued results that include non-UMD Banach spaces; see Silva [25].

Now for $f \in L^p([0,1);X)$ for some $1 < p < \infty$ consider the partial Walsh sums

$$S_N f(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \langle f, w_n \rangle w_n(x),$$

where w_n is the n-th Walsh function on $[0,1)$. Precise definitions will be given in Section 3.

The variational norm version of Carleson's theorem for vector-valued Walsh series is:

1.1. **Theorem.** *Given $q \in [2,\infty)$, let X be a Banach space which has tile-type τ for all $\tau > q$. Suppose that*

$$q < r \leq \infty, \quad 0 < \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{r'} - \frac{q-2}{r}.$$

Then for every $f \in L^p([0,1);X)$,

$$\|S_N f\|_{L^p([0,1);\mathcal{V}^r(X))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p([0,1);X)},$$

with the implicit constant depending only upon p, r, q and the space X.

Observe that for $q = 2$ the restriction on the integrability exponent becomes $p > r'$ which is necessary in the scalar case of the Fourier analog of Theorem 1.1, [19]. Here we get a condition that becomes more stringent as X 'moves away' from the Hilbert space case, quantified by the tile-type.

In the special case that X is an *intermediate space*, that is $X = [Y,H]_\theta$ is a complex interpolation space between some UMD Banach space Y and a Hilbert space H, and $0 < \theta < 1$, it was shown in [12] that X has tile-type $q = 2/\theta$. Thus Theorem 1.1 immediately applies to all intermediate spaces of this type. However, arguing directly by interpolation we get a slightly stronger theorem:

1.2. **Theorem.** *Suppose that $X := [Y,H]_\theta$, $0 < \theta < 1$, is a complex interpolation space between a UMD Banach space Y and a Hilbert space X. Set $q := 2/\theta$. Suppose that*

$$q < r \leq \infty, \quad 0 < \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{r'} - \frac{q-2}{2r}.$$

Then for every $f \in L^p([0,1);X)$ we have that

$$\|S_N f\|_{L^p([0,1);\mathcal{V}^r(X))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p([0,1);X)}.$$

where the implicit constant depends only on p, r, q and the space X.

So far the only Banach spaces which are known to have finite tile-type are exactly the complex interpolation spaces of Theorem 1.2. From this point of view, the weaker Theorem 1.1 seems uninteresting compared to Theorem 1.2. However, the formulation of Theorem 1.1 only assumes finite tile-type. This provides an indication that the finite tile-type of a Banach space X could be a strictly weaker hypothesis than that of X being a complex interpolation space. Furthermore, Theorem 1.1 has a partial converse. With details to be explained later on in the paper we show that if the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 is true for the operator $C_{r,\mathbf{P}}$, a linearized version of the variational Carleson operator, then X necessarily has tile-type τ for all $\tau > q$. Furthermore it is easy to see that tile-type q implies usual cotype q so cotype τ for all $\tau > q$ is a necessary condition for the boundedness of $C_{r,\mathbf{P}}$ in the range of Theorem 1.1.

The Fourier scalar variational Carleson theorem is related to a number of topics, including variational estimates for singular integrals [14]; refined estimates in ergodic theory [7, 8]; maximal inequalities [18], and approaches to extensions of results of Christ-Kiselev [6] in spectral theory, see [19, Appendix C]. Some of these continue to be under active development [9, 17]. At some point, these topics might be ripe for investigation in the vector valued case.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 3 we introduce tiles and trees in the time-frequency plane and define the corresponding wave packets in terms of appropriate Walsh functions. In section 4 we review the definition of the tile-type of a Banach space, adjusted to the needs of the present paper. This definition is slightly weaker than the one in [12] but philosophically it is the same. We also discuss several structural properties of the trees that one needs to consider in the definition of the tile-type and show that tile-type q implies martingale cotype q for any Banach space X. We also recall the vector-valued version of Lépingle's inequality which will play an important role later on in the proof. In section 5 we reduce the original Theorem 1.1 to a statement about a variant of the variational Carleson operator. For this variant we prove that the tile-type hypothesis is sharp. We eventually linearize all our operators and reduce the main theorem to the statement of Proposition 5.3. In Sections 6 to 8 we introduce all the necessary machinery from time-frequency analysis and prove Proposition 5.3. The last section 9 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2. The proof uses complex interpolation between the full range of r-variation inequalities, valid in any Hilbert space, and the ∞-variation bounds for intermediate spaces from [12].

2. NOTATION

Throughout the text c, C will denote generic positive constants that might change even in the same line of text. We write $A \lesssim B$ if $A \lesssim cB$ for some numerical constant $c > 0$. In this paper the implicit constants that appear in various estimates may depend on the variation index r, the integrability index p, the tile-type index q and the space X itself, but we typically suppress this dependence since it is of no importance. We denote by $\mathbb{N}$ the set of non-negative integers and by $\mathbb{R}_+$ the set of non-negative real numbers. Finally the dyadic intervals on the positive real line are denoted by $\mathcal{D}$. These are the intervals of the form $[n2^k,(n+1)2^k)$ where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. For any interval ω with endpoints $a < b$ we use the standard notation $\mathring{\omega} := (a,b)$ for its interior as well as the notations $[\omega) := [a,b)$ and $(\omega] := (a,b]$. If no special notation is used by convention we use $\omega = [\omega) = [a,b)$. We denote by $\mathbb{E}_k$ the conditional expectation with respect to dyadic intervals of length 2^k:

$$\mathbb{E}_k f(x) := \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D},|I|=2^k} \frac{\mathbf{1}_I(x)}{|I|}\int_I f(x)dx;$$

the dyadic maximal function is then $Mf(x) := \sup_k |E_k f(x)|$. Finally, we denote by BMO the dyadic BMO space on the positive real line, equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} = \|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} := \sup_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{|I|}\int_I \left|f(x) - \langle f\rangle_I\right| dx,$$

where $\langle f\rangle_I := \frac{1}{|I|}\int_I f$. Note that, throughout the text, the notation $|\cdot|$ is used both for the absolute value as well as for the norm of the Banach space X, depending on context.

3. Walsh wave packets, Tiles and Trees

A *tile* P is a dyadic rectangle of area 1 in the time-frequency plane $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$, namely

$$P = I_P \times \omega_P = I_P \times \frac{1}{|I_P|}[n,n+1), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \ I_P \in \mathcal{D},$$

If P, P' are tiles we write $P \leq P'$ if $I_P \subset I_{P'}$ and $\omega_{P'} \subset \omega_P$. Likewise, a *bitile* P is a dyadic rectangle of area 2:

$$P = I_P \times \omega_P = I_P \times \frac{2}{|I_P|}[n,n+1) = \bigcup_{v=0}^{1} I_P \times \frac{1}{|I_P|}[2n+v, 2n+v+1) =: P_d \cup P_u.$$

Thus each bitile P has a 'down-part' and an 'up-part' which are also dyadic. The partial order is also used for bitiles. Furthermore we write

$$P \leq_u P' \overset{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow} P_u \leq P'_u \quad \text{and} \quad P \leq_d P' \overset{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow} P_d \leq P'_d.$$

A tree $\mathbf{T}$ is a collection of bitiles P for which there exist a top bitile T, which is not necessarily part of the collection, such that $P \leq T$ for all $P \in \mathbf{T}$. Note that in general a top of a tree is not uniquely defined. Similarly we say that $\mathbf{T}$ is an *up-tree* if $P \leq_u T$ for all $P \in \mathbf{T}$ and some top T and a *down-tree* if $P \leq_d T$ for all $P \in \mathbf{T}$. Trivially any tree can be decomposed into an up-tree and a down-tree:

$$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}_u \cup \mathbf{T}_d, \quad \mathbf{T}_u \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{P \in \mathbf{T} : P \leq_u T\}, \quad \mathbf{T}_d \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{P \in \mathbf{T} : P \leq_d \mathbf{T}\}.$$

The Rademacher functions are defined as

$$r_i(x) := \operatorname{sgn}\sin(2\pi \cdot 2^i x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \Big(\mathbf{1}_{2^{-i}[k,k+1/2)}(x) - \mathbf{1}_{2^{-i}[k+1/2,k+1)}(x)\Big).$$

If $n \in \mathbb{N}$ has binary expansion

$$n = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} n_i 2^i, \quad n_i \in \{0, 1\},$$

we define the n-th Walsh function to be

$$w_n(x) := \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} r_i(x)^{n_i}.$$

Observe that we recover the Rademacher functions from the Walsh functions by means of $w_{2^i}(x) = r_i(x)$. It is well known and easy to see that the restrictions $\{w_n \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ form an orthonormal basis of $L^2(0, 1)$.

With these definitions at hand we now associate to each tile $P \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$ a *wave packet* w_P as follows. First we write the tile P with respect to its time and frequency components:

$$P = I_P \times \omega_P = I_P \times \frac{1}{|I_P|}[n, n+1), \quad I_P \in \mathcal{D}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The wave packet w_P is now defined as

$$w_P(x) := \frac{1}{|I_P|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \mathbf{1}_{I_P}(x) w_n\Big(\frac{x}{|I_P|}\Big) =: \frac{1}{|I_P|^{\frac{1}{2}}} w_P^{\infty}(x).$$

Observe that w_P is L^2-normalized while w_P^{∞} is L^{∞}-normalized, hence the superscript ∞. The Haar functions are special cases of wave packets corresponding to the tiles of the form $P = I \times |I|^{-1}[1, 2)$:

$$h_I(x) := \frac{1}{|I|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \mathbf{1}_I(x) r_0\Big(\frac{x}{|I|}\Big) = w_{I \times |I|^{-1}[1,2)}(x).$$

Given a bitile $P = P_d \cup P_u$ we use the notations w_{P_u} and w_{P_d} for the wave packets associated with the up-part and the down-part of the bitile P, respectively.

If a collection of bitiles arises from a single up-tree then the following lemma gives a very useful description of the wave packets in terms of the simpler Haar functions. This lemma is taken from [12, Lemma 2.2] where we also refer the reader for the proof.

3.1. **Lemma.** *Let* $\mathbf{T}$ *be an up-tree with top* T*. For all* $P \in \mathbf{T}$ *we have*

$$w_{P_d}(x) = \epsilon_{PT} \cdot w_{T_u}^{\infty}(x) \cdot h_{I_P}(x),$$

where $w_{T_u}^{\infty}$ *is the* L^{∞}*-normalized wave packet associated to the up-part of the top* T *and* $\epsilon_{PT} \in \{-1, +1\}$ *is a constant factor that depends only on* P *and* T*. In particular we have that*

$$\langle f, w_{P_d} \rangle w_{P_d} = \langle f \cdot w_{T_u}^{\infty}, h_{I_P} \rangle h_{I_P} \cdot w_{T_u}^{\infty}.$$

If $\mathbf{T}$ *is a down-tree with top* T *we have a symmetric statement:*

$$w_{P_u}(x) = \tilde{\epsilon}_{PT} \cdot w_{T_d}^{\infty}(x) \cdot h_{I_P}(x).$$

4. Tile-type and cotype of a Banach space

The notion of the tile-type of a Banach space X was introduced in [12] to show that if a Banach space X has finite tile-type then Carleson's theorem for Walsh-Fourier series is true for X-valued functions. More recently it was shown in [11] that a variant of the tile-type, adapted to the Fourier wave packets, also implies Carleson's theorem for the trigonometric system. Here we give a definition which is similar in spirit to that in [12, §3]. The main difference is that we only consider very special collections of trees in the definition of tile-type. These are essentially the trees generated by the selection algorithm in the size lemma, Lemma 7.2, and that lemma is the only place in the proof where the tile-type hypothesis is needed. In fact the reader is encouraged to briefly go through the statement and proof of the size lemma in order to gain some intuition on the definition that follows. The reason for giving this weaker but more complicated definition of tile-type is that it allows us to prove a partial converse of the variational Carleson theorem in Proposition 5.2, namely that the r-variational boundedness of a Carleson-type operator implies that the space X necessarily has tile-type τ for all $\tau > r$.

4.1. Good collections of trees and tile-type of a Banach space.

We now describe the collections of trees that we want to consider in the definition of the tile-type. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathbf{T}_j\}_j$ be a finite collection of up-trees, each consisting of finitely many bitiles, and set

$$\mathbf{P} := \{P : \ P \in \mathbf{T}_j \text{ for some } j\} = \cup_j \mathbf{T}_j .$$

Denote by $c(I)$ the center of some dyadic interval $I \in \mathcal{D}$. We will call the collection $\mathcal{T}$ *u(p)-good* if it has the following property:

There is a reordering of the trees $\{\mathbf{T}_j\}_j$ and a choice of corresponding tops $\{T_j\}_j$ such that $\{c(\omega_{T_j})\}_j$ is an increasing sequence and

$$\mathbf{T}_j = \{P \in \mathbf{P} : P \leq_u T_j \text{ and } P \nleq T_k \text{ for all } k < j\}.$$

There is a symmetric definition of a good collection of *down-trees*, namely a collection $\mathcal{T}$ of down-trees will be called *d(own)-good* if there is a reordering of the trees $\{\mathbf{T}_j\}_j$ and a choice of corresponding tops $\{T_j\}_j$ such that $\{c(\omega_{T_j})\}_j$ is a *decreasing* sequence and

$$\mathbf{T}_j = \{P \in \mathbf{P} : P \leq_d T_j \text{ and } P \nleq T_k \text{ for all } k < j\}.$$

We say that a Banach space X has *u-tile-type q* if the estimate

$$\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathcal{T}}\Big\|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}}\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}\Big\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)},$$

holds uniformly for all u-good collections $\mathcal{T}$. Similarly, we say that a Banach space X has d-tile type q if

$$\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathcal{T}}\Big\|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}}\langle f,w_{P_u}\rangle w_{P_u}\Big\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}}\lesssim\|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)},$$

uniformly, for all d-good collections $\mathcal{T}$. It is actually not hard to see that the two definitions of tile-type, namely the one given with respect to u-good collections and the one given with respect to d-good collections, are equivalent. This is the content of the following lemma.

4.1. **Lemma.** *A Banach space X has u-tile type q if and only if it has d-tile type q.*

Proof. Let us assume that X has u-tile type q and let $\mathcal{T}$ be a d-good collection of down-trees. Let us fix a choice of tops $\{T_j\}_j$ ordered so that the sequence of centers $\{c(\omega_{T_j})\}_j$ is *decreasing* and

$$\mathbf{T}_j=\{P\in\mathbf{P}: P\leq_d T_j \text{ and } P\nleq T_k \text{ for all } k<j\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{P}$ be the collection of all tiles in $\mathcal{T}$ and define $2^N:=\sup_{P\in\mathbf{P}}\sup\omega_P$. For any bitile $P\in\mathbf{P}$, $P=I_P\times|I_P|^{-1}[n,n+2)$, we define the transformation:

$$P\mapsto\tilde{P}:=I_P\times[2^N-(n+2)|I_P|^{-1},2^N-n|I_P|^{-1}).$$

By the choice of N the transformation above maps bitiles $P\subset\mathbb{R}_+\times\mathbb{R}_+$ into bitiles $\tilde{P}\subset\mathbb{R}_+\times\mathbb{R}_+$ so that

$$\widetilde{P_d}=\tilde{P}_u,\quad \widetilde{P_u}=\tilde{P}_d.$$

That is, the down-part of a bitile P transforms into the up-part of the bitile $\tilde{P}$ and vice versa. Transforming the tops $\{T_j\}_j$ accordingly we obtain a collection $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, consisting of up-trees, and a sequence of tops $\{\tilde{T}_j\}_j$ which together form a u-good collection. By the assumption that X has u-tile type q we thus get

$$\Big(\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}\in\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}\Big\|\sum_{\tilde{P}\in\tilde{\mathbf{T}}}\langle f,w_{\tilde{P}_d}\rangle w_{\tilde{P}_d}\Big\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}}\lesssim\|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}.$$

Once this estimate is written down, the specific choice of tops $\{T_j\}_j$ is not relevant any more. For each tree $\mathbf{T}_j$ it is clear that we can choose a top S_j with $|I_{S_j}|=\max_j|I_{T_j}|$. Thus the number $|I_{S_j}|$ does not depend on j. Applying Lemma 3.1 to the tiles $\tilde{P}$ belonging to the up-tree $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}$ with top $\tilde{S}$, we have

$$w_{\tilde{P}_d}(x)=\tilde{\epsilon}_{PS}\cdot h_{I_S}(x)\cdot w^\infty_{\tilde{S}_u}(x)\quad\text{and}\quad w_{P_u}(x)=\epsilon_{PS}\cdot h_{I_S}(x)\cdot w^\infty_{S_d}(x).$$

Define $2^m:=2^N|I_S|$ and note that this number *does not* depend on the specific choice of tree $\mathbf{T}$. In order to derive a relation between $w^\infty_{\tilde{S}_u}$ and $w^\infty_{S_d}$ let us write $S=I_S\times|I_S|^{-1}[n,n+2)$ so that $S_d = I_S \times |I_S|^{-1}[n, n+1)$ and $\tilde S_u = I_S \times |I_S|^{-1}[2^m - n - 1, 2^m - n)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} w^{\infty}_{\tilde S_u}(x) &= \mathbf{1}_{I_S}(x) w_{2^m-n-1}(x/|I_S|) = \mathbf{1}_{I_S}(x) w_{2^m-1}(x/|I_S|) w_n(x/|I_S|) \\ &= w_{2^m-1}(x/|I_S|)\cdot w^{\infty}_{S_d}(x) =: \phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x)\cdot w^{\infty}_{S_d}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_{\mathbf{P}}$ is a unimodular function that depends only on the collection $\mathbf{P}$. Thus

$$\|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} \gtrsim \Big(\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}\in\tilde{\mathcal{T}}} \Big\|\sum_{\tilde P\in\tilde{\mathbf{T}}} \langle f, w_{\tilde P_d}\rangle w_{\tilde P_d}\Big\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}\Big)^{\frac1q} = \Big(\sum_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathcal{T}} \Big\|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}} \langle f\phi_{\mathbf{P}}, w_{P_u}\rangle w_{P_u}\phi_{\mathbf{P}}\Big\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}\Big)^{\frac1q}.$$

Replacing f by $f\phi_{\mathbf{P}}^{-1}$ in the previous estimate we conclude that X has d-tile type q. The proof of the reverse implication is completely symmetric. □

4.2. *Remark.* In view of Lemma 4.1 we will henceforth say that a Banach space X has *tile type q* whenever it has u-tile type or d-tile-type q. We will also talk about good collections $\mathcal{T}$ without specifying whether we are talking about u-good or d-good collections. Furthermore, it is obvious that if a collection of trees can be split into a finite number k of good collections then the tile-type inequality still holds for the original collection with some different constant depending on k. We will then say that $\mathcal{T}$ is a k-good collection, or just a good collection if it is clear that the number k does not depend on anything interesting.

The following lemma gathers some useful properties of good collections $\mathcal{T}$ and is the main ingredient in the proof of the partial converse in Proposition 5.2.

4.3. **Lemma.** *Let $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathbf{T}_j\}_{j=1}^M$ be a good collection of up-trees and denote by $\mathbf{P}$ the set of all bitiles in $\mathcal{T}$. Let $\{T_j\}_{j=1}^M$ be the collection of the corresponding tops from the definition a good collection, ordered so that $\{c(\omega_{T_j})\}_j$ is increasing. We have the following properties:*

(i) The down-parts of the bitiles in $\mathcal{T}$ are disjoint:

$$\text{if } P, P' \in \mathbf{P} \text{ and } P \neq P' \text{ then } P'_d \cap P_d = \emptyset.$$

(ii) Let $k(j,x) := \max_k\{1 \le k \le j : I_{T_k} \ni x\}$ with the understanding that $\max\emptyset := 0$. For $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M\}$ define the measurable functions $N_j : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ as $N_j(x) := c(\omega_{T_{k(j,x)}})$. Let us also set $N_0(x) \equiv 0$ for convenience. For any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the sequence $\{N_j(x)\}_j$ is increasing. Furthermore, for each j and $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have

$$\{P \in \mathbf{T}_j : I_P \ni x\} = \{P \in \mathbf{P} : I_P \ni x,\ N_j(x) \in [\omega_{P_u}) \text{ and } N_{j-1}(x) \notin \mathring{\omega}_P\}.$$

(iii) For $1 \le r < \infty$ we have

$$\sum_j \Big\|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_j} \langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}\Big\|^r_{L^r(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} = \int \sum_j \Big|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{P}} \langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)\mathbf{1}_{\{N_j(x)\in[\omega_{P_u}),\ N_{j-1}(x)\notin\mathring{\omega}_P\}}\Big|^r dx.$$

Proof. For (i) observe that if two bitiles $P, P' \in \mathbf{P}$ belong to the same tree $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}$ then we always have $P_d \cap P'_d = \emptyset$ since $\mathbf{T}$ is an up-tree. Suppose now that $P \in \mathbf{T}_j$, $P' \in \mathbf{T}_k$ where $\mathbf{T}_j, \mathbf{T}_k$ are two different trees in $\mathcal{T}$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $P_d \cap P'_d \neq \emptyset$ so that $I_P \cap I_{P'} \neq \emptyset$ and $\omega_{P_d} \cap \omega_{P'_d} \neq \emptyset$. Then we have for example that $\omega_{P_d} \subseteq \omega_{P'_d}$. However, since P, P' are different tiles we must actually have that $\omega_P \subseteq \omega_{P'_d}$. Thus

$$\omega_{T_j} \subseteq \omega_P \subseteq \omega_{P'_d} \subset \omega_{P'} \text{ and } \emptyset \neq I_P \cap I_{P'} \subseteq I_{T_j} \cap I_{P'}$$

which implies that $P' \leq T_j$. We then get the following inequality for the centers of $\omega_{T_j}, \omega_{T_k}$:

$$c(\omega_{T_j}) < \sup \omega_{T_j} \leq \sup \omega_P \leq \sup \omega_{P'_d} = \inf \omega_{P'_u} \leq \inf \omega_{T_{k,u}} = c(\omega_{T_k}).$$

By the definition of a good collection we thus have that $j < k$ so that $P' \nleq T_j$, a contradiction.

We now prove (ii). First note that for every fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the sequence $\{N_j(x)\}_j$ is increasing as a composition of increasing functions of j. In order to prove the main claim in (ii) we fix $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $j \in \{1 \ldots, M\}$ and define the collections of bitiles

$$S(j,x) := \{P \in \mathbf{T}_j : I_P \ni x\}, \quad B(j,x) := \{P \in \mathbf{P} : I_P \ni x, N_j(x) \in \omega_{P_u},\ N_{j-1}(x) \notin \mathring{\omega}_P\},$$

where $N_j(x)$ is as in the statement of the lemma. We claim that $S(j,x) = B(j,x)$. If $x \notin I_{T_j}$ then both collections are empty: for $S(j,x)$ this is because $x \notin I_{T_j} \supseteq I_P$ while for $B(j,x)$ because $N_{j-1}(x) = N_j(x)$ in this case.

It remains to verify the claim when $x \in I_{T_j}$ in which case $N_j(x) = c(\omega_{T_j})$ and $N_{j-1}(x) \in \{0, c(\omega_{T_{k(j-1,x)}})\}$.

Let $P \in S(j,x)$. Then $x \in I_P \subseteq I_{T_j}$ and by the definition of the good collection we have that $P \leq_u T_j$ and $P \nleq T_k$ for any $k \leq j-1$. The condition $P \leq_u T_j$ implies that $N_j(x) = c(\omega_{T_j}) \in \omega_{P_u}$. If $x \notin \cup_{\ell \leq j-1} I_{T_\ell}$ then $N_{j-1}(x) = 0$ which is never in the interior of any frequency interval thus $N_{j-1}(x) \notin \mathring{\omega}_P$ in this case. On the other hand if $x \in \cup_{\ell \leq j-1} I_{T_\ell}$ we have that $x \in I_{T_{k(j-1,x)}}$ and $P \nleq T_{k(j-1,x)}$ since $k(j-1,x) < j$. Since $x \in I_P \cap I_{T_{k(j-1,x)}} \neq \emptyset$ we must have $\omega_{T_{k(j-1,x)}} \nsubseteq \omega_P$ and thus $N_{j-1}(x) = c(\omega_{T_{k(j-1,x)}}) \notin \mathring{\omega}_P$. This proves the inclusion $S(j,x) \subseteq B(j,x)$.

For the opposite inclusion assume that $P \in B(j,x)$. Since $x \in I_{T_j}$ we have that $N_j(x) = c(\omega_{T_j}) \in \omega_{P_u}$ which is equivalent to $\omega_{T_{j,u}} \subseteq \omega_{P_u}$. Since $x \in I_P \cap I_{T_j}$ this shows that $P \leq_u T_j$. Now it is not hard to see that $P \nleq T_\ell$ whenever $\ell < j$. Indeed suppose that we had $P \leq T_\ell$ for some $\ell < j$. This would imply that $x \in I_P \subseteq I_{T_\ell}$ and thus $\ell \leq k(j-1,x) < j$. Furthermore we would have $\omega_{T_\ell}, \omega_{T_j} \subseteq \omega_P$ so by the convexity of the interval ω_P and the fact that the sequence $\{c(\omega_{T_j})\}_j$ is increasing we would conclude that $N_{j-1}(x) = c(\omega_{T_{k(j-1,x)}}) \in \mathring{\omega}_P$, contradicting the second condition in the definition of $B(j,x)$. This proves the inclusion $B(j,x) \subseteq S(j,x)$ and thus concludes the proof of (ii).

Finally part (iii) of the lemma is an obvious application of the identity $S(j,x) = B(j,x)$. $\square$

In the following paragraphs of this section we will investigate how the tile-type condition relates to the classical cotype of a Banach space. For this we will need to be able to view the dyadic intervals inside $[0,1)$ as the time intervals of bitiles of a suitable good collection. This is the content of the following lemma.

4.4. **Lemma.** *Let* $\mathcal{J}$ *be a finite collection of dyadic intervals in* $[0,1)$ *and define* $2^{-N} := \min_{I\in\mathcal{J}} |I|$.

(i) Let $\mathbf{T} := \{I\times[2^{N+1}-2|I|^{-1}, 2^{N+1}) : I\in\mathcal{J}\}$. *Then* $\mathbf{T}$ *is an up-tree and* $\mathcal{J} = \{I_P : P = I_P\times\omega_P \in \mathbf{T}\}$.

(ii) There exists a good collection of up-trees $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathbf{T}_j\}_{j=0}^N$ *such that* $\mathbf{T} = \cup_j \mathbf{T}_j$ *and*

$$\{I\in\mathcal{J} : |I| = 2^{j-N}\} = \{I_P : P = I_P\times\omega_P\in\mathbf{T}_j\}, \quad 0\leq j\leq N.$$

(iii) For $1\leq r<\infty$ *and every* $f\in L^r([0,1);X)$ *we have the identity*

$$\sum_{j=0}^N \Big|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_j} \langle w^\infty_{\mathcal{J}} f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)\Big|^r = \sum_{j=0}^N \Big|\sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{J}\\ |I|=2^{-j}}} \langle f, h_I\rangle h_I(x)\Big|^r,$$

where $w^\infty_{\mathcal{J}}$ *is a unimodular function that depends only on the collection* $\mathcal{J}$.

Proof. For (i) it is enough to notice that the tile $T := [0,1)\times[2^{N+1}-2, 2^{N+1})$ satisfies $P\leq_u T$ for all $P\in\mathbb{T}$. Let us now show (ii). For $I\in\mathcal{J}$ we set $\omega_I := [2^{N+1}-2|I|^{-1}, 2^{N+1})$ and for all $0\leq j\leq N$ we define the trees

$$\mathbf{T}_j := \{P = I\times\omega_I : I\in\mathcal{J},\ |I| = 2^{j-N}\}.$$

We define an appropriate top T_j for each tree $\mathbf{T}_j$ by setting

$$T_j := [0,2)\times[2^{N+1}-2^{N-j}, 2^{N+1}-2^{N-j}+1).$$

Suppose that $P = I_P\times\omega_P\in\mathbf{T}_j$ for some $j\in\{0,1,\ldots,N\}$. Then

$$\omega_{T_j} = [2^{N+1}-|I_P|^{-1}, 2^{N+1}-|I_P|^{-1}+1)\subset\omega_{P_u}$$

and obviously we always have that $I_P\subset I_{T_k}$. Thus each T_j is a top of $\mathbf{T}_j$ and hence each $\mathbf{T}_j$ is an up-tree. By construction the sequence $\{c(\omega_{T_j})\}_{j\leq N}$ is strictly increasing and furthermore the intervals ω_{T_j} are disjoint. We first show that the collection $\{\mathbf{T}_j\}_{j\leq N}$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{T}_j = \{P\in\mathbf{P} : P\leq_u T_j \text{ and } P\not\leq_u T_k \text{ for all } k<j\},$$

where $\mathbf{P}$ is the collection of all the bitiles contained in the trees $\mathbf{T}_j$. Let $P\in\mathbf{T}_j$. We already saw that $P\leq_u T_j$. Furthermore for $k<j$ we have that $\sup\omega_{T_k}\leq\inf\omega_{T_j}\leq\inf\omega_{P_u}$ which implies that $P\not\leq_u T_k$ whenever $k<j$. This proves

$$\mathbf{T}_j\subseteq\{P\in\mathbf{P} : P\leq_u T_j \text{ and } P\not\leq_u T_k \text{ for all } k<j\}.$$

Now assume that $P\in\{P\in\mathbf{P} : P\leq_u T_j \text{ and } P\not\leq_u T_k \text{ for all } k<j\}$. Then we have $P\leq_u T_j$ thus $\omega_{T_{j,u}}\subseteq\omega_{P_u}$ which implies that $2^{N+1}-|I_P|^{-1}\leq 2^{N+1}-2^{N-j} \Leftrightarrow |I_P|\leq 2^{j-N}$. We claim that

in fact $|I_P| = 2^{j-N}$. Indeed, if $|I_P| \leq 2^{(j-1)-N}$ then we would get that $\omega_{T_{j-1,u}} \subseteq \omega_{P_u}$ and this in turn would give that $P \leq_u T_{j-1}$ which is a contradiction. Since $P \in \mathbf{P}$ and $|I_P| = 2^{j-N}$ we get that $P \in \mathbf{T}_j$.

Observe that if $P \in \mathbf{T}_j$ for some j then by construction $P \cap T_k = \emptyset$ for all $k < j-1$. Thus we have $P \nleq_u T_k \Leftrightarrow P \nleq T_k$ for $k < j-1$. We now split the collection $\mathcal{T}$ into two collections by setting say $\mathcal{T}_1 = \{\mathbf{T}_{2j}\}_j$ and $\mathcal{T}_2 = \{T_{2j+1}\}_j$ and each collection $\mathcal{T}_\nu$, $\nu = 1, 2$, is good. This shows that the original collection $\mathcal{T}$ is a 2-good collection.

For (iii), remember that the trees $\mathbf{T}_j$ share a common top $T = [0,1) \times [2^{N+1} - 2, 2^{N+1})$. Thus, Lemma 3.1 implies that

$$\Big|\sum_{P \in \mathbf{T}_j} \langle f, w_{P_d} \rangle w_{P_d}(x)\Big| = \Big|\sum_{P \in \mathbf{T}_j} \langle f w_T^\infty, h_{I_P} \rangle w_T^\infty h_{I_P}\Big| = \Big|\sum_{I \in \mathcal{J}} \langle f w_T^\infty, h_{I_P} \rangle h_{I_P}\Big|,$$

which proves the claim in (iii) by setting $w_{\mathcal{J}}^\infty := w_T^\infty$ and replacing f by $f w_{\mathcal{J}}^\infty$. □

Finally we recall the main result proved in [12] concerning the tile-type of an interpolation space X. Observe that by Lemma 4.3 the down-parts of all bitiles in a good collection $\mathcal{T}$ are disjoint; thus the following Proposition is identical to [12, Proposition 3.1].

4.5. **Proposition.** *A necessary condition for tile-type q is that X is a UMD space and $q \geq 2$. If a UMD space has tile-type q, it has tile-type p for all $p \in [q, \infty)$. Every Hilbert space has tile-type 2, and every complex interpolation space $[Y, H]_\theta$, $\theta \in (0,1)$, between a UMD space Y and a Hilbert space H has tile-type $2/\theta$.*

4.2. Tile-type implies cotype.

We observe in this paragraph that the hypothesis that a Banach space X has tile-type q implies that the space X has Rademacher and martingale cotype equal to q. We recall the relevant definitions.

Let $2 \leq q \leq \infty$. We say that a Banach space X has (Rademacher) cotype q if

$$\Big(\sum_{j \geq 0} |x_j|^q\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \Big\|\sum_{j \geq 0} r_j x_j\Big\|_{L^q([0,1);X)}$$

holds uniformly for all finite sequences $\{x_j\}_j \subset X$, where $\{r_j\}_j$ are the Rademacher functions on $[0,1)$.

On the other hand, we say that X has martingale cotype $q \in [2, \infty]$ (or M-cotype q) if for all X-valued martingales $\{M_n\}_n$ we have

$$\Big(\mathbb{E}\sum_{n \geq 0} |M_n - M_{n-1}|^q\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \Big(\sup_n \mathbb{E}|M_n|^q\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Every Banach space trivially has cotype and M-cotype ∞. In general the notion of M-cotype is stronger than that of usual cotype but the two notions are equivalent in the case that X has the UMD property. Finally we note that martingale cotype is equivalent to Haar cotype, meaning that it is suffices to consider Haar martingales in the definition of M-cotype. See [21].

The following proposition shows that tile-type implies M-cotype with the same index :

4.6. **Proposition.** *Suppose that the Banach space X has tile-type $q \geq 2$. Then X is UMD and has M-cotype q.*

Proof. The fact that tile-type q implies the UMD property is already contained in Proposition 4.5 but we include a proof here for the sake of completeness. It will suffice to show that

$$\Big\|\sum_{I\in\mathcal{J}} \epsilon_I \langle f, h_I\rangle h_I\Big\|_{L^r([0,1);X)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r([0,1);X)}.$$

where $\mathcal{J}$ is any finite collection of dyadic intervals inside $[0,1)$, $f \in L^r([0,1);X)$, $\epsilon_I \in \{-1,+1\}$ and r is some fixed exponent in $(1,\infty)$. Because of the following trivial estimate

$$\Big|\sum_{I\in\mathcal{J}} \epsilon_I \langle f, h_I\rangle h_I\Big| = \Big|\sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{J}\\ \epsilon_I=1}} \langle f, h_I\rangle h_I - \sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{J}\\ \epsilon_I=-1}} \langle f, h_I\rangle h_I\Big| \leq \Big|\sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{J}\\ \epsilon_I=1}} \langle f, h_I\rangle h_I\Big| + \Big|\sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{J}\\ \epsilon_I=-1}} \langle f, h_I\rangle h_I\Big|,$$

it will actually suffice to prove that

$$\Big\|\sum_{I\in\mathcal{J}} \epsilon_I \langle f, h_I\rangle h_I\Big\|_{L^r([0,1);X)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r([0,1);X)}.$$

whenever $\epsilon_I \in \{0,1\}$. However this amounts to showing that

$$\Big\|\sum_{I\in\mathcal{J}'} \langle f, h_I\rangle h_I\Big\|_{L^r([0,1);X)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r([0,1);X)},$$

for any finite collection $\mathcal{J}'$ of dyadic intervals in $[0,1)$. Consider the up-tree given by (i) of Lemma 4.4 applied to the collection $\mathcal{J}'$:

$$\mathbf{T} := \{I \times [2^{N+1} - 2|I|^{-1}, 2^{N+1}) : I \in \mathcal{J}'\},$$

where N is such that $|I| \geq 2^{-N}$ for all $I \in \mathcal{J}'$. By the tile-type hypothesis for the collection consisting of the single tree $\mathbf{T}$ and Lemma 3.1 we now get the UMD condition for Haar martingales with $r = q$.

We will now show that X has martingale cotype q. By Lemma 4.4 we have for every positive integer N that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N} \Big|\sum_{|I|=2^{-k}} \langle f, h_I\rangle h_I(x)\Big|^q = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \Big|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_j} \langle w_N^\infty f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)\Big|^q,$$

where $\{\mathbf{T}_j\}_{j=0}^{N}$ is a good collection of up-trees. Since X has tile-type q the right hand side is controlled by $\|f\|_{L^q([0,1);X)}$. Thus

$$\sum_{0\leq k\leq N}\Big\|\sum_{|I|=2^{-k}}\langle f,h_{I_P}\rangle h_{I_P}\Big\|_{L^q([0,1);X)}^{q}\lesssim\|f\|_{L^q([0,1);X)}^{q},$$

with the implicit constant not depending on N. This is the cotype condition for Haar martingale differences which by [21] is equivalent to X having martingale cotype q. □

4.3. **Vector-valued Lépingle inequality.** The variational Carleson theorem, in the scalar case, depends on certain jump inequalities originally due to Lépingle [16]. This fact has been recorded and well understood in several papers as for example in [10], [19], [14]. For the Banach space case that we are considering we will need the appropriate vector-valued extension proved by Pisier and Xu in [22]:

4.7. **Theorem** ([22, Theorem 4.3])**.** *Suppose that X has cotype τ for all $\tau > q$. Then we have Lépingle's inequality for functions $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}_+;X)$:*

$$\|\mathbb{E}_n f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}_+;\mathcal{V}^r(X))}\lesssim\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}_+;X)},$$

for all $r > q$ and $1 < p < \infty$.

By Proposition 4.6 one can replace the cotype $\tau > q$ hypothesis in Theorem 4.7 by the hypothesis that X has tile-type τ for all $\tau > q$. We will use this fact in what follows without further comment.

5. LINEARIZATION OF THE VARIATIONAL CARLESON OPERATOR

In this section we linearize the variational norm of the partial Walsh-Fourier sums of a function f, using more or less standard arguments as in [26], [12], [10] and [19]. We reduce the statement of Theorem 1.1 to an analogous statement about some closely related linearized versions of the variational Carleson operator which are more amenable to the time-frequency analysis techniques and interpolation. We carry the tile-type hypothesis throughout the section in the statements of our reduced theorems.

For any collection of bitiles $\mathbf{P}$ we define the operator

$$C_{r,\mathbf{P}}f(x):=\sup_{K,N_0<\cdots<N_K}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{K}\Big|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{P}}\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)\mathbf{1}_{\{N_j\in[\omega_{P_u}),\ N_{j-1}\notin\mathring{\omega}_P\}}\Big|^{r}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r}},$$

where the supremum is taken over all positive integers K and all *non-negative real numbers* $N_0 < N_1 < \cdots < N_K$. There is a symmetric version, denoted by $\tilde{C}_{r,\mathbf{P}}f(x)$, in which the down-tiles are replaced by up-tiles and the condition in the indicator is replaced by $N_j \notin \mathring{\omega}_P$, $N_{j-1} \in (\omega_{P_d}]$, namely:

$$\tilde{C}_{r,\mathbf{P}}f(x) := \sup_{K, N_0 < \cdots < N_K} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{K} \Big| \sum_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \langle f, w_{P_u} \rangle w_{P_u}(x) \mathbf{1}_{\{N_j \in (\omega_{P_d}],\ N_{j-1} \notin \mathring{\omega}_P\}} \Big|^r \Big)^{\frac{1}{r}},$$

These operators are formed over all bitiles, namely, one only requires $I_P \subset [0, \infty)$.

Theorem 1.1 will be a consequence of the following theorem for $C_{r,\mathbf{P}}$ and its symmetric analog for $\tilde{C}_{r,\mathbf{P}}$:

5.1. **Theorem.** *Let X be a Banach space with tile-type τ for all $\tau > q$ and $\mathbf{P}$ be any collection of bitiles. We have*

$$\|C_{r,\mathbf{P}} f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} \lesssim_{p,r,q} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}_+;X)},$$

whenever $q < r < \infty$ and $0 < \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{r'} - \frac{q-2}{r}$.

Concerning the proof of this Theorem, we focus on the operator $C_{r,\mathbf{P}}f(x)$, using in particular the partial order on bitiles and their organization into trees, among other techniques. The main hypothesis is that the space X has finite tile type arbitrarily close to some number q. The reader here should prefer to think of the tile type hypothesis in the formulation given for families of up-trees, that is, in the equivalent formulation of the u-tile type. For the operator, $\tilde{C}_{r,\mathbf{P}}f$, the proof is completely symmetric, in view of Lemma 4.1, where the role of the down tile P_d is analogous to that of the up-tile, and vice-versa. For all the considerations concerning the operator $\tilde{C}_{r,\mathbf{P}}f$ we switch our point of view to the formulation of the d-tile type. Bearing this in mind it is routine to adjust the arguments in this paper, given for the operator $C_{r,\mathbf{P}}f$, in order to give the corresponding proof for the symmetric operator $\tilde{C}_{r,\mathbf{P}}f$. We thus omit any further discussion concerning the proof of Theorem 5.1 for the dual operator $\tilde{C}_{r,\mathbf{P}}f$.

We briefly describe how to conclude Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 5.1:

Proof of Theorem 1.1. For integers $0 < \zeta < \zeta'$, let $\Omega_{\zeta,\zeta'}$ be the maximal dyadic intervals $\omega \subset [\zeta, \zeta')$. These intervals partition $[\zeta, \zeta')$, and moreover we have

$$S_{\zeta'} f - S_{\zeta} f = \sum_{\substack{P \text{ is a tile} \\ I_P \subset [0,1),\ \omega_P \in \Omega_{\zeta,\zeta'}}} \langle f, w_P \rangle w_P \,.$$

This follows from [26, Corollary 8.3] and is a variant of the the formula [26, p. 68-69]. Now, let $\Omega^{u/d}_{\zeta,\zeta'}$ be those intervals $\omega \in \Omega_{\zeta,\zeta'}$ for which ω is the up/down–half of its parent. Let $\mathbf{P}^{u/d}_{\zeta,\zeta'}$

be the collection of *bitiles* such that $\omega_{P_d} \in \Omega^{u/d}_{\zeta,\zeta'}$, and $I_P \subset [0,1)$. We then have

$$S_{\zeta'} f - S_{\zeta} f = \sum_{\sigma \in \{u,d\}} \sum_{P \in \mathbf{P}^{\sigma}_{\zeta,\zeta'}} \langle f, w_{P_\sigma} \rangle w_{P_\sigma} .$$

We have $P \in \mathbf{P}^{d}_{\zeta,\zeta'}$ if and only if $I_P \subset [0,1)$, $\zeta \notin \mathring{\omega}_P$, and $\zeta' \in [\omega_{P_u})$, conditions in agreement with the conditions on N_{j-1}, N_j in the definition of $C_{r,\mathbf{P}} f$. In the symmetric case, we have $P \in \mathbf{P}^{u}_{\zeta,\zeta'}$ if and only if $I_P \subset [0,1)$, $\zeta \in (\omega_{P_d}]$, and $\zeta' \notin \mathring{\omega}_P$. All together, for any K, $N_0 < \cdots < N_K$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{K} |S_{N_{j-1}} f - S_{N_j}|^r &= \sum_{j=1}^{K} \Big| \sum_{\sigma \in \{u,d\}} \sum_{P \in \mathbf{P}^{\sigma}_{N_{j-1},N_j}} \langle f, w_{P_\sigma} \rangle w_{P_\sigma} \Big|^r \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in \{u,d\}} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \Big| \sum_{P \in \mathbf{P}^{\sigma}_{N_{j-1},N_j}} \langle f, w_{P_\sigma} \rangle w_{P_\sigma} \Big|^r \\ &\lesssim (C_{r,\mathbf{P}_1} f)^r + (\tilde{C}_{r,\mathbf{P}_2} f)^r ,\end{aligned}$$

for some fixed collections of bitiles $\mathbf{P}_1$ and $\mathbf{P}_2$. Using Theorem 5.1, which is valid for arbitrary collections $\mathbf{P}$, and the pointwise inequality just proved, completes the proof. □

As promised in the introduction, the variational formulation of the Walsh-Carleson theorem can give some intuition on the role of the tile-type hypothesis in a quantitative manner. One expression of this heuristic is that Theorem 5.1 is sharp as far as the tile-type hypothesis is concerned.

5.2. **Proposition.** *Let X be some Banach space and suppose that for any collection of bitiles $\mathbf{P}$, the operator $C_{r,\mathbf{P}}$, or the operator $\tilde{C}_{r,\mathbf{P}}$, satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 5.1 with $p = r$:*

$$\|C_{r,\mathbf{P}} f\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}_+;X)},$$

whenever $q < r < \infty$. Then X has tile-type τ for all $\tau > q$ and, a fortiori, X has cotype τ for all $\tau > q$.

Proof. We will prove the proposition assuming that the operator $C_{r,\mathbf{P}}$ is bounded on $L^r(\mathbb{R}_+;X)$ for all $r > q$. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathbf{T}_j\}$ be a good collection of trees. By Lemma 4.3, (ii), there is an increasing sequence of integer valued functions $\{N_j(x)\}_j$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_j \Big\| \sum_{P \in \mathbf{T}_j} \langle f, w_{P_d} \rangle w_{P_d} \Big\|^r_{L^r(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} &= \sum_j \Big\| \sum_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \langle f, w_{P_d} \rangle w_{P_d} \mathbf{1}_{\{N_j \in [\omega_{P_u}),\ N_{j-1} \notin \mathring{\omega}_P\}} \Big\|^r_{L^r(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} \\ &\le \|C_{r,\mathbf{P}} f\|^r_{L^r(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} \lesssim_r \|f\|^r_{L^r(\mathbb{R}_+;X)},\end{aligned}$$

since $C_{r,\mathbf{P}}$ is bounded on $L^r(\mathbb{R}_+;X)$. If the hypothesis is true for $\tilde{C}_{r,\mathbf{P}}$ we consider d-good collections of trees and show the corresponding statement for the d-tile type. The conclusion then follows by using the analogue of Lemma 4.3 for d-good collections. □

Following [10] we consider the linearized version of $C_{r,\mathbf{P}}$ given by

$$C_{\mathbf{P}}f(x)=C_{r,a,\mathbf{P}}f(x):=\sum_{j=1}^{K(x)}\sum_{P\in\mathbf{P}}\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)\mathbf{1}_{\{N_j(x)\in[\omega_{P_u}),\ N_{j-1}(x)\notin\mathring{\omega}_P\}}a_j(x),$$

where $K,N_1,\dots N_K:\mathbb{R}_+\to\mathbb{N}$ are arbitrary measurable functions and $a=\{a_j\}_j$ is a sequence of X^*-valued functions with $\sum_{j=1}^{K(x)}|a_j(x)|^{r'}=1$. The expression for the operator $C_{\mathbf{P}}$ can be simplified by writing

$$C_{\mathbf{P}}f(x)=\sum_{P\in\mathbf{P}}\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)\sum_{j=1}^{K(x)}\mathbf{1}_{\{N_j(x)\in[\omega_{P_u}),\ N_{j-1}(x)\notin\mathring{\omega}_P\}}a_j(x)=\sum_{P\in\mathbf{P}}\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)\,a_P(x),$$

where

$$a_P(x):=\sum_{j=1}^{K(x)}\mathbf{1}_{\{N_j(x)\in[\omega_{P_u}),\ N_{j-1}(x)\notin\mathring{\omega}_P\}}a_j(x).$$

The operator $C_{\mathbf{P}}$ depends on both r and the choice of the sequence a but we suppress this fact in what follows in order to simplify our notation.

Note here that our assumption that X has tile-type $\tau\in(q,\infty)$ can be replaced by the assumption that X has tile-type exactly q. This is because all our conclusions are given in terms of *open* intervals with respect to p,r and q. By restricted weak type interpolation and duality, the proof of Theorem 5.1 thus reduces to the proof of the following statement:

5.3. **Proposition.** *Suppose that X is a Banach space with tile-type $q\geq 2$. Let $F,E\subset\mathbb{R}_+$ be measurable sets with $|F|,|E|<+\infty$. Then there is a major subset $E'\subseteq E$ with $|E'|\geq\frac{1}{2}|E|$ such that, for all $f:X\to\mathbb{R}_+$ with $|f|\leq\mathbf{1}_F$, and all $g:X^*\to\mathbb{R}_+$ with $|g|\leq\mathbf{1}_{E'}$, we have*

$$|\langle C_{\mathbf{P}}f,g\rangle|\lesssim|F|^{\frac{1}{p}}|E|^{\frac{1}{p'}},$$

whenever $0<\frac{1}{p}<\frac{1}{r'}-\frac{q-2}{r}$.

5.4. *Remark.* Observe that

$$|\langle C_{\mathbf{P}}f,g\rangle|\leq\sum_{P\in\mathbf{P}}|\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle\langle w_{P_d}a_P,g\rangle|=\sum_{P\in\mathbf{P}}\epsilon_P\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle\langle w_{P_d}a_P,g\rangle=|\langle C^+_{\mathbf{P}}f,g\rangle|$$

for some choice of signs $\epsilon_P\in\{-1,+1\}$, where

$$C^+_{\mathbf{P}}f(x):=\sum_{P\in\mathbf{P}}\epsilon_P\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)\,a_P(x).$$

We will thus prove the estimate in Proposition 5.3 for the larger operator $C^+_{\mathbf{P}}$, which we immediately rename again to $C_{\mathbf{P}}$, and any *finite* collection of bitiles $\mathbf{P}$.

6. The tree lemma

Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a finite collection of bitiles. The *density* of the collection $\mathbf{P}$ is

$$\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P}) := \sup_{P\in\mathbf{P}} \sup_{P'\geq P} \Big(\frac{1}{|I_{P'}|}\int_{I_{P'}} |g(x)|^{r'} \sum_{j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega_{P'}} |a_j(x)|^{r'}\,dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}}.$$

We define the *size* of a collection $\mathbf{P}$ to be

$$\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{P}) := \sup_{\mathbf{T}\subseteq\mathbf{P}\ \text{up-tree}} \Big(\frac{1}{|I_T|}\int\Big|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}}\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)\Big|^q dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

6.1. **Lemma** (Tree lemma)**.** *For every tree* $\mathbf{T}$ *we have*

$$\|gC_{\mathbf{T}}f\|_{L^s(\mathbb{R}_+)} = \Big\|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}}\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d} a_P g\Big\|_{L^s(\mathbb{R}_+)} \lesssim \operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T})\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})|I_T|^{\frac{1}{s}},$$

for all $1\leq s\leq r'$.

We will prove the lemma for the case $s = r'$ which, by Hölder's inequality, implies the conclusion for $1 \leq s \leq r'$ as well. Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the collection of maximal dyadic intervals contained in I_T that do not contain any I_P, $P\in\mathbf{T}$. The intervals in the collection $\mathcal{J}$ form a partition of I_T thus

$$\begin{aligned}\|gC_{\mathbf{T}}f\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)} &= \Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}}\int_J\Big|\sum_{\substack{P\in\mathbf{T}\\ I_P\supsetneq J}}\epsilon_P\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)a_P(x)g(x)\Big|^{r'}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}}\\ &= \Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}}\Big\|\sum_{\substack{P\in\mathbf{T}\\ I_P\supsetneq J}}\epsilon_P\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}a_P g\Big\|^{r'}_{L^{r'}(J)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}}.\end{aligned}$$

We set for $P\in\mathbf{T}$ and $j\geq 1$

$$A(P,j) := I_P\cap\{x:\ N_{j-1}(x)\notin\mathring{\omega}_P,\ N_j(x)\in[\omega_{P_u})\}.$$

We gather some auxiliary calculations in the following lemma:

6.2. **Lemma.** *Fix a tree* $\mathbf{T}$ *and a top* T *of* $\mathbf{T}$ *and consider the partition of* I_T *into the intervals* $J\in\mathcal{J}$. *Let* $J\in\mathcal{J}$ *and denote by* $J^{(1)}$ *the dyadic parent of* J. *There exist bitiles* $Q(J)\in\mathbf{T}$ *and* $P(J) = J^{(1)}\times\omega(J)$ *such that:*

(i) $Q(J) \leq P(J) \leq T$.

(ii) For every $j \in [1, K(x)]$ *we have the pointwise inequality:* $\mathbf{1}_J \mathbf{1}_{A(P,j)} \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{x:\ N_j(x) \in \omega(J)\}}$.

(iii) We have the estimate

$$\int_J |g(x)|^{r'} \sum_{j:\ N_j(x) \in \omega(J)} |a_j(x)|^{r'} dx \lesssim |J| \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})^{r'}.$$

Proof. Fix some $J \in \mathcal{J}$. Since J is maximal with the property that it doesn't contain any I_P, $P \in \mathbf{T}$, there is some bitile $Q(J) \in \mathbf{T}$ such that $I_{Q(J)} \subseteq J^{(1)}$, where $J^{(1)}$ is the dyadic parent of J. Observe that we must have $J^{(1)} \subseteq I_T$. Define the frequency interval $\omega(J)$ with $|\omega(J)| = 2/|J^{(1)}|$ and such that $\omega_T \subseteq \omega(J) \subseteq \omega_{Q(J)}$. Thus the bitile $P(J) := J^{(1)} \times \omega(J)$ satisfies $Q(J) \leq P(J) \leq T$. This proves *(i)*.

Now for all bitiles $P \in \mathbf{T}$ such that $I_P \cap J \neq \emptyset$ we have $J \subsetneq I_P$ by the maximality of J which implies that $|I_P| \geq |J^{(1)}|$. For every such P we thus have $\emptyset \neq \omega_T \subseteq \omega_P \cap \omega(J)$ and so $\omega_P \subseteq \omega(J)$. We conclude

$$\bigcup_{P \in \mathbf{T}:\ I_P \cap J \neq \emptyset} \omega_P \subseteq \omega(J).$$

Let x be such that $\mathbf{1}_J(x)\mathbf{1}_{A(P,j)}(x) \neq 0$. Then $I_P \cap J \neq \emptyset$ and $N_j(x) \in \omega_{P_u} \subset \omega_P \subseteq \omega(J)$. The previous inclusion thus implies $\mathbf{1}_J \mathbf{1}_{A(P,j)} \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{x:\ N_j(x) \in \omega(J)\}}$.

Finally, we have $P(J) \geq Q(J)$ and $Q(J) \in \mathbf{T}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_J |g(x)|^{r'} \sum_{j:\ N_j(x) \in \omega(J)} |a_j(x)|^{r'} dx &\lesssim |J| \frac{1}{|J^{(1)}|} \int_{J^{(1)}} |g(x)|^{r'} \sum_{j:\ N_j(x) \in \omega(J)} |a_j(x)|^{r'} dx \\ &= |J| \frac{1}{|I_{P(J)}|} \int_{I_{P(J)}} |g(x)|^{r'} \sum_{j:\ N_j(x) \in \omega_{P(J)}} |a_j(x)|^{r'} dx \\ &\leq |J| \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})^{r'}, \end{aligned}$$

by the definition of density. □

For $\tau \in \{u = \text{up}, d = \text{down}\}$ define the functions

$$\begin{aligned} F_{J,\tau}(x) &:= \mathbf{1}_J(x) g(x) \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathbf{T}_\tau \\ I_P \supsetneq J}} \epsilon_P \langle f, w_{P_d} \rangle w_{P_d}(x) a_P(x) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_J(x) g(x) \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathbf{T}_\tau \\ I_P \supsetneq J}} \sum_{j=1}^{K(x)} \epsilon_P \langle f, w_{P_d} \rangle w_{P_d}(x) a_j(x) \mathbf{1}_{A(P,j)}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since every tree $\mathbf{T}$ can be written as a union of its up-part $\mathbf{T}_u$ and its down-part $\mathbf{T}_d$, we have the estimate

$$\|gC_{\mathbf{T}}f\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)} \leq \Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}}\|F_{J,d}\|^{r'}_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}} + \Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}}\|F_{J,u}\|^{r'}_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}}.$$

We estimate the two terms appearing in the previous sum separately.

6.3. **Lemma.** *We have*

$$\Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}}\|F_{J,d}\|^{r'}_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \lesssim |I_T|^{\frac{1}{r'}}\,\mathrm{density}(\mathbf{T})\,\mathrm{size}(\mathbf{T}).$$

Proof. The function $F_{J,d}$ can be written as

$$F_{J,d}(x) = \mathbf{1}_J(x)g(x)\sum_{\substack{P\in\mathbf{T}_d\\ I_P\supsetneq J}}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\epsilon_P\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)a_j(x)\mathbf{1}_{[j,\infty)}(K(x))\mathbf{1}_{A(P,j)}(x).$$

Now consider two pairs $(j,P)\neq(j',P')$ appearing in the previous sum, with $j,j'\geq 1$ and $P,P'\in\mathbf{T}_d$ such that $I_P, I_{P'}\supsetneq J$. We claim that $A(P,j)\cap A(P',j')=\emptyset$. Indeed, since $\mathbf{T}_d$ is a down-tree we have $\omega_{T_d}\subseteq\omega_{P_d}\cap\omega_{P'_d}\neq\emptyset$ and thus the bigger interval contains the smaller. For example we have $\omega_{P'_d}\subseteq\omega_{P_d}\Rightarrow\omega_{P'}\subseteq\omega_P$.

If $j'<j\Leftrightarrow j'\leq j-1$ and $x\in A(P,j)$ then we have $(x,N_j(x))\in P_u$ and $(x,N_{j-1}(x))\notin\mathring{P}$. Since $N_j(x)>N_{j-1}(x)$ we get that necessarily $N_{j-1}(x)\leq\min\omega_P$. Thus

$$N_{j'}(x)\leq N_{j-1}(x)\leq\min\omega_P\leq\min\omega_{P'}\Rightarrow N_{j'}(x)\notin\omega_{P'_u}\Rightarrow x\notin A(P',j').$$

Suppose now that $j'>j\Leftrightarrow j\leq j'-1$. If $x\in A(P',j')$ then $(x,N_{j'}(x))\in P'_u$ and $(x,N_{j'-1}(x))\notin\mathring{P}'$. Since $N_{j'}(x)\geq N_{j'-1}(x)$ we must have $N_{j'-1}(x)\leq\min\omega_{P'}$. Thus

$$N_j(x)\leq N_{j'-1}(x)\leq\min\omega_{P'}=\min\omega_{P'_d}<\min\omega_{P_u}\Rightarrow N_j(x)\notin\omega_{P_u}\Rightarrow x\notin A(P,j).$$

In every case we get that $A(P,j)\cap A(P',j')\neq\emptyset\Rightarrow j=j'$. However all the up-parts P_u, $P\in\mathbf{T}_d$, are disjoint since $\mathbf{T}_d$ is a down-tree, so we cannot have $N_j(x)\in\omega_{P_u}\cap\omega_{P'_u}$ with $P\neq P'$. We conclude that $A(P,j)\cap A(P',j')\neq\emptyset\Rightarrow(P,j)=(P',j')$ as claimed.

The disjointness property of the $A(P,j)$'s, the definition of size and (ii) of Lemma 6.2 imply that for any fixed x

$$\begin{aligned}|F_{J,d}(x)| &\leq |g(x)|\sup_{\substack{P\in\mathbf{T}_d\\ I_P\supsetneq J}}\sup_{1\leq j\leq K(x)}\frac{|\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle|}{|I_P|^{\frac{1}{2}}}|a_j(x)|\mathbf{1}_J(x)\mathbf{1}_{A(P,j)}(x)\\ &\leq \mathrm{size}(\mathbf{T})|g(x)|\sup_{1\leq j\leq K(x)}|a_j(x)|\mathbf{1}_{\{y:\ N_j(y)\in\omega(J)\}}(x)\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T})|g(x)|\Big(\sum_{j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega(J)}|a_j(x)|^{r'}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}}.$$

Integrating the previous estimate raised to the power r' yields

$$\|F_{d,J}\|^{r'}_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)}\lesssim \operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T})^{r'}\int_J|g(x)|^{r'}\sum_{j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega(J)}|a_j(x)|^{r'}dx\lesssim|J|\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T})^{r'}\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})^{r'},$$

by Lemma 6.2, (iii). Since the collection $\mathcal{J}$ partitions I_T, summing in $J\in\mathcal{J}$ gives

$$\Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}}\|F_{d,J}\|^{r'}_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}}\lesssim\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T})\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})\Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}}|J|\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}}=|I_T|^{\frac{1}{r'}}\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T})\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T}),$$

as we wanted. □

The proof for the up-part is more involved:

6.4. **Lemma.** *We have*

$$\Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}}\|F_{J,u}\|^{r'}_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}}\lesssim|I_T|^{\frac{1}{r'}}\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T}).$$

Proof. We fix some $J\in\mathcal{J}$ and $x\in J$ so that $F_{J,u}(x)\neq 0$. We use Lemma 3.1 in order to write the function $F_{J,u}$ in the form:

$$F_{J,u}(x)=\mathbf{1}_J(x)g(x)w^{\infty}_{T_u}(x)\sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq K(x)\\ j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega(J)}}\ \sum_{\substack{P\in\mathbf{T}_u\\ I_P\supsetneq J}}\epsilon_P\epsilon_{PT}\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle h_{I_P}(x)a_j(x)\mathbf{1}_{A(P,j)}(x),$$

where $\epsilon_P\epsilon_{PT}\in\{-1,+1\}$ and $w^{\infty}_{T_u}$ is unimodular and depends only on the upper tile of the top T of $\mathbf{T}$. Now for every $1\leq j\leq K(x)$ with $N_j(x)\in\omega(J)$, consider the inner sum

$$\sum_{\substack{P\in\mathbf{T}_u\\ I_P\supsetneq J}}\epsilon_P\epsilon_{PT}\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle h_{I_P}(x)a_j(x)\mathbf{1}_{A(P,j)}(x).$$

The frequency intervals ω_{P_u}, $P\in\mathbf{T}_u$, all contain the top interval ω_{T_u} and thus they are nested. Consider P,j such that $\mathbf{1}_{A(P,j)}(x)\neq 0$. We have $N_{j-1}(x)\notin\omega_P$ and $N_j(x)\in\omega_{P_u}$. For all bitiles $P'\in\mathbf{T}_u$ with $|I_{P'}|\leq|I_P|$ we have that $\omega_{P_u}\subseteq\omega_{P'_u}$ and hence, that $N_j(x)\in\omega_{P'_u}$. Likewise, for all bitiles P' with $|I_{P'}|\geq|I_P|$ we have $\omega_{P_u}\supseteq\omega_{P'_u}$ and hence, that $N_{j-1}(x)\notin\omega_{P'_u}$. For fixed $J\in\mathcal{J}$ and for every $x\in J$ and $1\leq j\leq K(x)$, there are thus some dyadic intervals $J\subset I^{\text{small}}_{x,j}\subsetneq I^{\text{large}}_{x,j}\subsetneq I^{\text{small}}_{x,j+1}$ and we have

$$\Big|\sum_{\substack{P\in\mathbf{T}_u\\ I_P\supsetneq J}}\epsilon_P\epsilon_{PT}\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle h_{I_P}(x)a_j(x)\mathbf{1}_{A(P,j)}(x)\Big|=\Big|\sum_{\substack{P\in\mathbf{T}_u\\ I^{\text{small}}_{x,j}\subsetneq I_P\subseteq I^{\text{large}}_{x,j}}}\epsilon_P\epsilon_{PT}\langle f,w_{P_d}\rangle h_{I_P}(x)a_j(x)\Big|.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \Big|a_j(x)w^{\infty}_{T_u}(x)(\mathbb{E}_{I^{\text{small}}_{x,j}} - \mathbb{E}_{I^{\text{large}}_{x,j}})\Big(\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_u} \epsilon_P\epsilon_{PT}\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle h_{I_P}\Big)(x)\Big| \\
&= \Big|a_j(x)(\mathbb{E}_{I^{\text{small}}_{x,j}} - \mathbb{E}_{I^{\text{large}}_{x,j}})\Big(w^{\infty}_{T_u}\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_u} \langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}\Big)(x)\Big|,
\end{aligned}$$

since $|w^{\infty}_{T_u}| = 1$.

Denote by $\mathbb{E}_{\ell} f$ the martingale of dyadic averages of f with respect to dyadic intervals of length 2^{ℓ}. Summing in $j \in [1, K(x)]$ for which $N_j(x) \in \omega(J)$ and using Hölder's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|F_{J,u}(x)| &\leq \mathbf{1}_J(x)|g(x)| \sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq K(x)\\ j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega(J)}} \Big|a_j(x)(\mathbb{E}_{I^{\text{small}}_{x,j}} - \mathbb{E}_{I^{\text{large}}_{x,j}})\Big(w^{\infty}_{T_u}\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_u} \langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}\Big)(x)\Big| \\
&\leq \mathbf{1}_J(x)|g(x)| \Big(\sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq K(x)\\ j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega(J)}} |a_j(x)|^{r'}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \Big(\sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq K(x)\\ j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega(J)}} \Big|(\mathbb{E}_{\ell_j} - \mathbb{E}_{\ell'_j})(w^{\infty}_{T_u}\tilde{f})(x)\Big|^r\Big)^{\frac{1}{r}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ldots,$ are integers with $|J| \leq 2^{\ell_1} < 2^{\ell'_1} < 2^{\ell_2} < 2^{\ell'_2} < \ldots < 2^{\ell_j} < 2^{\ell'_j} < \ldots,$ and $\tilde{f} := \sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_u} \epsilon_P\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}$. Taking the supremum over all such choices of integers $\ell_j, \ell_j{}'$ for $1 \leq j \leq K$ and all positive integers K and integrating over J gives the estimate

$$\int_J |F_{J,u}(x)|^{r'} dx \leq \int_J |g(x)|^{r'} \sum_{j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega(J)} |a_j(x)|^{r'} \|\, \mathbb{E}_k(w^{\infty}_{T_u}\tilde{f})(x)\|^{r'}_{\mathcal{V}^r_{2^k\geq|J|}} dx.$$

Here we denote

$$\|b_k\|_{\mathcal{V}^r_{2^k\geq A}} := \sup_K \sup_{\substack{\ell_0<\ell_1<\cdots<\ell_K\\ 2^{\ell_j}\geq A,\ j=0,\ldots,K}} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{K} \|\beta_{\ell_{j+1}} - \beta_{\ell_j}\|^r\Big)^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

The function $\|\mathbb{E}_k w^{\infty}_{T_u}\tilde{f}(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{V}^r_{2^k\geq|J|}}$ is constant on J thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F_{J,u}\|^{r'}_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)} &\leq \int_J |g(x)|^{r'} \sum_{j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega(J)} |a_j(x)|^{r'}\Big(\frac{1}{|J|}\int_J \|\, \mathbb{E}_k(w^{\infty}_{T_u}\tilde{f})(z)\|_{\mathcal{V}^r_{2^k\geq|J|}} dz\Big)^{r'} dx \\
&\leq |J|\, \text{density}(\mathbf{T})^{r'} \inf_J \Big[M\Big(\|\, \mathbb{E}_k(w^{\infty}_{T_u}\tilde{f})(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{V}^r}\Big)\Big]^{r'} \\
&\leq \text{density}(\mathbf{T})^{r'} \int_J \Big[M\Big(\|\, \mathbb{E}_k(w^{\infty}_{T_u}\tilde{f})(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{V}^r}\Big)(y)\Big]^{r'} dy,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we also used Lemma 6.2, (iii). Now we sum over $J \in \mathcal{J}$ to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}} \|F_{J,u}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)}^{r'}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}} &\leq \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})\Big(\int_{I_T}\Big[M(\|\mathbb{E}_k(w_{T_u}^{\infty}\tilde{f})(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{V}^r}(y)\Big]^{r'} dy\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \\
&\lesssim \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})\Big(\int_{I_T}\Big[\|\mathbb{E}_k(w_{T_u}^{\infty}\tilde{f})(y)\|_{\mathcal{V}^r}\Big]^{r'} dy\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \\
&\overset{(*)}{\lesssim} \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)} \overset{(**)}{\lesssim} \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})\Big\|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_u}\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}\Big\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}_+)} \\
&\leq |I_T|^{\frac{1}{r'}} \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T})\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T}),
\end{aligned}
$$

since $r' < q' \leq 2 \leq q$. In $(*)$ we have the vector-valued Lépingle inequality from Proposition 4.7 while in $(**)$ we use the UMD property of X. □

7. THE SIZE AND DENSITY LEMMAS

Let X be a UMD Banach space with tile-type $q \geq 2$. In this section we recall the standard selection algorithms in terms of density and size. In terms of density we have:

7.1. **Lemma** (Density lemma). *Let* $\mathbf{P}$ *be a finite collection of bitiles and* $\delta > 0$. *Define* density$(\mathbf{P})$ *with respect to some function* $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to X^*$ *with* $|g| \leq \mathbf{1}_E$, *where* $E \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ *is a measurable set of finite measure, and a sequence* $\{a_j(x)\}_j$ *with* $\sum_j |a_j(x)|^{r'} = 1$. *There exists a decomposition*

$$
\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_{\text{sparse}} \cup \bigcup_j \mathbf{T}_j,
$$

where each $\mathbf{T}_j$ *is a tree and*

$$
\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P}_{\text{sparse}}) \leq 2^{-\delta}\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P}), \qquad \sum_j |I_{T_j}| \leq 2^{\delta r'}\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P})^{-r'}|E|.
$$

Proof. We choose $\mathbf{P}_{\text{sparse}}$ to be as big as possible

$$
\mathbf{P}_{\text{sparse}} := \Big\{P \in \mathbf{P} : \sup_{P'\geq P}\frac{1}{|I_{P'}|}\int_{I_{P'}}|g(x)|^{r'}\sum_{j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega_{P'}}|a_j(x)|^{r'}dx \leq 2^{-r'\delta}\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P})^{r'}\Big\}.
$$

For every $P \in \mathbf{P} \setminus \mathbf{P}_{\text{sparse}}$ there exists a bitile P' such that

$$
|I_{P'}| \leq 2^{r'\delta}\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P})^{-r'}\int_{I_{P'}}|g(x)|^{r'}\sum_{j:\ N_j(x)\in\omega_{P'}}|a_j(x)|^{r'}dx.
$$

Among the chosen bitiles P' let us call $\{T_k\}_k$ the bitiles that are maximal with respect to the partial order '$\leq$'. Now set

$$\mathbf{T}_k := \{P \in \mathbf{P}_{\text{sparse}} : P \leq T_k\}.$$

It is clear that $\mathbf{P} \setminus \mathbf{P}_{\text{sparse}} = \cup_k \mathbf{T}_k$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_k |I_{T_k}| &\leq 2^{r'\delta} \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P})^{-r'} \sum_k \sum_j \int_{I_{T_k}} |g(x)|^{r'} |a_j(x)|^{r'} \mathbf{1}_{\{y:\ N_j(y) \in \omega_{T_k}\}}(x) dx \\ &\leq 2^{r'\delta} \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P})^{-r'} \sum_j \sum_k \int_{I_{T_k} \cap E \cap \{y:\ N_j(y) \in \omega_{T_k}\}} |a_j(x)|^{r'} dx.\end{aligned}$$

Now, for j fixed, the sets $I_{T_k} \cap E \cap \{y : N_j(y) \in \omega_{T_k}\}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, are all contained in E and are pairwise disjoint for different k's. Indeed if two of them intersected, say for $k_1 \neq k_2$, then the corresponding bitiles T_{k_1}, T_{k_2} would also intersect, which contradicts their maximality. Summing first in k and then in j we get

$$\sum_k |I_{T_k}| \leq 2^{r'\delta} \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P})^{-r'} \sum_j \int_E |a_j(x)|^{r'} dx \leq 2^{r'\delta} \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P})^{-r'} |E|,$$

since $\sum_j |a_j(x)|^{r'} = 1$. □

For the selection by size we prove a version of the standard size selection algorithm:

7.2. **Lemma** (Size lemma)**.** *Let* $\mathbf{P}$ *be a finite collection of bitiles and* X *a Banach space of quartile-type* $q \geq 2$. *Define* $\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{P})$ *with respect to some function* $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}_+; X)$ *and suppose that* $\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{P}) \leq \sigma$. *There exists a disjoint decomposition*

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_{\text{small}} \cup \bigcup_j \mathbf{T}_j,$$

where each $\mathbf{T}_j$ *is a tree and*

$$\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{P}_{\text{small}}) \leq 2^{-\frac{1}{q}}\sigma, \qquad \sum_j |I_{T_j}| \lesssim \sigma^{-q} \|f\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}.$$

Furthermore, if $|f| \leq \mathbf{1}_F$ *for some measurable set* $F \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ *of finite measure, we have the following* BMO*-bound for the top time intervals:*

$$\Big\| \sum_j \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_j}} \Big\|_{\text{BMO}} \lesssim \sigma^{-q},$$

where BMO *stands for the dyadic* BMO *on the positive real line.*

The selection algorithm is contained in [12, Proposition 6.1] but we briefly outline it here for the reader's convenience. Furthermore we prove the last statement which is standard, but not yet recorded in the vector-valued setup.

Proof. For every tree $\mathbf{T}$ we set

$$\Delta(\mathbf{T})^q := \frac{1}{|I_T|}\int \Big|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_u}\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x)\Big|^q dx,$$

where T is a top of $\mathbf{T}$. We iterate the following selection algorithm. Consider all maximal trees inside $\mathbf{P}$ with $\Delta(\mathbf{T}) > \sigma 2^{-\frac{1}{q}}$. Among them let $\mathbf{T}_1$ be one with top T_1 whose frequency interval ω_{T_1} has minimal center. Replace $\mathbf{P}$ by $\mathbf{P}\setminus\mathbf{T}_1$ and iterate. When no trees can be selected any longer the remaining collection, $\mathbf{P}_{\text{small}}$, by definition satisfies $\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{P}_{\text{small}}) \leq 2^{-\frac{1}{q}}\sigma$. Let $\{\mathbf{T}_j\}_j$ be the selected trees. The top time intervals $I_{T_j}{}_j$ of the selected trees can be thus estimated by

$$\sum_j |I_{T_j}| \leq \frac{2}{\sigma^q}\sum_j \Big\|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_{j,u}}\langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}\Big\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}$$

The collection $\mathcal{T} := \{\mathbf{T}_{j,u}\}_j$ of the selected up-trees is a *good* collection by construction. Thus the tile-type property of X implies that the sum on the right hand side of the previous estimate can be estimated by $\|f\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}$. We get

$$\sum_j |I_{T_j}| \lesssim \sigma^{-q}\|f\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}.$$

It remains to prove the BMO-bound for the sums of top time intervals. Let J be a dyadic interval. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{|J|}\int_J\Big|\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_j}}(x) - \frac{1}{|J|}\int_J\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_j}}(y)dy\Big|dx &= \frac{1}{|J|}\int_J\Big|\sum_{j:\, I_{T_j}\subsetneq J}\mathbf{1}_{I_{T_j}}(x) - \frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{j:\, I_{T_j}\subsetneq J}|I_{T_j}|\Big|dx\\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{j:\, I_{T_j}\subsetneq J}|I_{T_j}| \leq \frac{1}{|J|}\frac{2}{\sigma^q}\sum_{j:\, I_{T_j}\subsetneq J}\Big\|\sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_{j,u}}\langle f\mathbf{1}_J, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}\Big\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}\\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{|J|}\sigma^{-q}\|f\mathbf{1}_J\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)},
\end{aligned}$$

by another application of the tile-type of X. Now $|f| \leq \mathbf{1}_F$ implies $\|f\mathbf{1}_J\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} \leq |F\cap J| \leq |J|$. Taking the supremum over dyadic intervals J completes the proof of the BMO estimate. □

We record some additional size estimates that will allow us to obtain some initial control on the size of the collections we will consider.

7.3. **Lemma.** *Let* $\mathbf{P}$ *be any collection of bitiles and define the density with respect to some function* $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to X^*$ *with* $|g| \leq \mathbf{1}_E$ *and the size with respect to some function* $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to X$ *with* $|f| \leq \mathbf{1}_F$. *We have that* $\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P}) \leq 1$ *and* $\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{P}) \lesssim 1$.

The proof of the density estimate is completely trivial while the proof of the size estimate is in [12, Lemma 7.1] and relies on the UMD property of X. The following lemma is a BMO-type of estimate and is contained in [12, Lemma 7.2].

7.4. **Lemma.** *Let $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \{I \in \mathcal{D} : \inf_{y \in I} Mf(x) \leq \lambda\}$ be a finite collection of dyadic intervals and K be a dyadic interval. Then*

$$\Big\| \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{J} \\ I \subseteq K}} \langle f, h_I \rangle h_I \Big\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} \leq \lambda |K|^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

for all $1 \leq p < \infty$.

8. Proof of Proposition 5.3

We need to prove that for every pair of measurable sets E, F with $|E|, |F| < +\infty$ there exists a major subset $E' \subset E$, $|E'| \geq \frac{1}{2}|E|$ such that

$$|\langle C_{\mathbf{P}} f, g \rangle| \lesssim |F|^{\frac{1}{p}} |E|^{\frac{1}{p'}}$$

for $\frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{r'} - \frac{q-2}{r}$ and for all $|f| \leq \mathbf{1}_F$, $|g| \leq \mathbf{1}_{E'}$. By dilation invariance we can assume that $1 < |E| \leq 2$.

Case 1: $|F| \leq 1$. Let

$$G := \{M(\mathbf{1}_F) > 4|F|\}.$$

Then $|G| \leq \frac{1}{4}$ thus $E' := E \setminus G$ can be taken as a major subset of E. We have

$$\langle C_{\mathbf{P}} f, g \rangle = \sum_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \langle f, w_{P_d} \rangle \langle w_{P_d} a_P, g \rangle = \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathbf{P} \\ I_P \nsubseteq G}} + \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathbf{P} \\ I_P \subseteq G}}.$$

The second sum vanishes since each w_{P_d} is supported on $I_P \subseteq G$ while g is supported on $E' \subseteq G^c$. Hence it suffices to consider any collection $\mathbf{P}' \subseteq \{P \in \mathbf{P} : I_P \nsubseteq G\}$ and prove the corresponding bound for $C_{\mathbf{P}'}$ in the place of $C_{\mathbf{P}}$. For any such collection $\mathbf{P}'$ a standard argument using Lemmas 3.1 and 7.4 shows that we always have the bound

$$\operatorname{size}(\mathbf{P}') \lesssim \frac{|F|}{|E|} \leq |F|.$$

For the details of this argument see for example the proof of [12, Lemma 7.3]. Since $\mathbf{P}'$ is a finite collection of bitiles there exists some positive integer n_o such that

$$\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P}') \leq 2^{\frac{n_o}{r'}} |E|, \quad \operatorname{size}(\mathbf{P}') \leq 2^{\frac{n_o}{q}} |F|^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Iterating the density lemma with $\delta = \frac{1}{r'}$ and the size lemma we write $\mathbf{P}'$ as a union of trees

$$\mathbf{P}' = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \bigcup_{j} \mathbf{T}_{n,j},$$

such that

$$\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T}_{n,j}) \le 2^{\frac{n}{r'}}|E|, \quad \operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T}_{n,j}) \le 2^{\frac{n}{q}}|F|^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_j |I_{\mathbf{T}_{n,j}}| \lesssim 2^{-n}.$$

Recalling the trivial estimate $\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P}) \le 1$ of Lemma 7.3 for any collection $\mathbf{P}$ we thus have

$$\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T}_{n,j}) \lesssim \min(1, 2^{\frac{n}{r'}}), \quad \operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T}_{n,j}) \le \min(|F|, 2^{\frac{n}{q}}|F|^{\frac{1}{q}}).$$

Applying the Lemma 6.1 with $s = 1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle C_{\mathbf{P}} f, g\rangle| &= \Big| \int \sum_{P\in\mathbf{P}} \epsilon_P \langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x) a_P(x) g(x) dx \Big| \\
&\le \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_j \int \Big| \sum_{P\in\mathbf{T}_{n,j}} \epsilon_P \langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x) a_P(x) g(x) dx \Big| \\
&\le \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_j |I_{T_{n,j}}| \operatorname{size}(\mathbf{T}_{n,j}) \operatorname{density}(\mathbf{T}_{n,j}) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \min(|F|, 2^{\frac{n}{q}}|F|^{\frac{1}{q}}) \min(1, 2^{\frac{n}{r'}}) \sum_j |I_{T_{n,j}}| \\
&\lesssim \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-n} \min(|F|, 2^{\frac{n}{q}}|F|^{\frac{1}{q}}) \min(1, 2^{\frac{n}{r'}}).
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate the previous sum as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle C_{\mathbf{P}} f, g\rangle| &\lesssim |F|^{\frac{1}{q}} \sum_{n:\ 2^n \le |F|^{\frac{q}{q'}}} 2^{n(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{r})} + |F| \sum_{n:\ |F|^{\frac{q}{q'}} < 2^n \le 1} 2^{n(\frac{1}{r'}-1)} + |F| \sum_{n:1<2^n} 2^{-n} \\
&\lesssim |F|^{1-\frac{q-1}{r}} + |F| \lesssim |F|^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last approximate inequality we used $1 - \frac{q-1}{r} = \frac{1}{r'} - \frac{q-2}{r} > \frac{1}{p}$ and the hypothesis $|F| \le 1$.

Case 2: $|F| \ge 1$. Let $\mathbf{P}$ be any finite collection of bitiles and set $E' := E$. By the trivial size and density estimates of Lemma 7.3 we have

$$\operatorname{density}(\mathbf{P}) \le 1 \le 2^{\frac{0}{r'}}|E|, \quad \operatorname{size}(\mathbf{P}) \lesssim 1 \le 2^{\frac{0}{q}}|F|^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

We apply the density lemma and the size lemma recursively to decompose

$$\mathbf{P} = \bigcup_{n\ge 0} \bigcup_j \mathbf{T}_{n,j} =: \bigcup_{n\ge 0} \mathcal{T}_n,$$

where each $\mathcal{T}_n$ is the union of the trees, $\{\mathbf{T}_{n,j}\}_j$, and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\operatorname{density}(\mathcal{T}_n) \leq 2^{-\frac{n}{r'}}, \quad \operatorname{size}(\mathcal{T}_n) \lesssim \min(1, 2^{-\frac{n}{q}}|F|^{\frac{1}{q}}),$$

and

$$\Big\|\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_{n,j}}}\Big\|_{L^1} = \sum_j |I_{T_{n,j}}| \lesssim 2^n,$$

$$\Big\|\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_{n,j}}}\Big\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} \lesssim 2^n|F|^{-1}.$$

By interpolation of the last two bounds we get for any $1 \leq \tau < \infty$:

$$\Big\|\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_{n,j}}}\Big\|_{L^\tau} \lesssim 2^n|F|^{-\frac{1}{\tau'}}. \tag{8.1}$$

For n fixed we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\langle C_{\mathcal{T}_n} f, g\rangle\big| &\leq \sum_j \int \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_{n,j}}}(x)\Big|\sum_{P \in \mathbf{T}_{n,j}} \epsilon_P \langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x) g(x) a_P(x)\Big| dx \\
&\leq \int \Big(\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_{n,j}}}(x)\Big)^{\frac{1}{r}} \Big(\sum_j \Big|\sum_{P \in \mathbf{T}_{n,j}} \epsilon_P \langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d}(x) g(x) a_P(x)\Big|^{r'}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}} dx \\
&\leq \Big\|\Big(\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_{n,j}}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r}}\Big\|_{L^\tau} \Big\|\Big(\sum_j \Big|\sum_{P \in \mathbf{T}_{n,j}} \epsilon_P \langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d} g a_P\Big|^{r'}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}}\Big\|_{L^{\tau'}} =: A \cdot B,
\end{aligned}$$

for $\tau > r$. We note that the function inside the norm in B is supported in E and $\tau' < r'$. Thus, Hölder's inequality and Lemma 6.1 imply

$$\begin{aligned}
B &\leq |E|^{\frac{1}{\tau'} - \frac{1}{r'}} \Big(\sum_j \Big\|\sum_{P \in \mathbf{T}_{n,j}} \epsilon_P \langle f, w_{P_d}\rangle w_{P_d} g a_P\Big\|_{L^{r'}}^{r'}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \\
&\lesssim \operatorname{size}(\mathcal{T}_n) \operatorname{density}(\mathcal{T}_n) \Big(\sum_j |I_{T_{n,j}}|\Big)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \\
&\lesssim \min(1, 2^{-\frac{n}{q}}|F|^{\frac{1}{q}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Using (8.1) we estimate A as follows

$$A = \Big\|\Big(\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_{n,j}}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r}}\Big\|_{L^\tau} = \Big\|\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{I_{T_{n,j}}}\Big\|_{L^{\tau/r}}^{\frac{1}{r}} \lesssim \Big(2^n|F|^{-\frac{1}{(\tau/r)'}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r}} = 2^{\frac{n}{r}}|F|^{-\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{\tau}}.$$

Gathering the estimates and we get for all $\tau > r$

$$\big|\langle C_{\mathcal{T}_n} f, g\rangle\big| \lesssim 2^{\frac{n}{r}} \min(1, 2^{-\frac{n}{q}}|F|^{\frac{1}{q}})|F|^{-\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{\tau}}.$$

Summing in $n \geq 0$ thus gives,

$$\sum_{n\geq 0} \left|\langle C_{\mathcal{T}_n} f, g\rangle\right| \lesssim |F|^{-\frac{1}{r}+\frac{1}{\tau}} \sum_{n:\ 2^n<|F|} 2^{\frac{n}{r}} + |F|^{\frac{1}{\tau}+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{r}} \sum_{n:\ 2^n\geq|F|} 2^{n(\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{q})} \lesssim |F|^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \leq |F|^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

if we choose τ so that $\tau > \max(p, r)$, since $|F| \geq 1$. We have also used the hypothesis $r > q$ in penultimate estimate.

This conclude the proof of Proposition 5.3 and thereby of Theorems 5.1 and 1.1.

9. Interpolation

In this section we discuss the proof of Theorem 1.2. This is a simple interpolation argument between the Hilbert space-valued case for the r-variation and the UMD valued case for the ∞-variation, that is the main result from [12].

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let X be a UMD Banach space of the form $X = [Y, H]_\theta$ for some $0 < \theta < 1$ and set $q =: 2/\theta$. From [12] we have that the Carleson operator maps $L^p([0,1); X)$ into itself for all $1 < p < \infty$. This can be rewritten in the form

$$\|S_N f\|_{L^p([0,1);\ell^\infty(X))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p([0,1);X)}, \quad 1 < p < \infty.$$

On the other hand we have for any Hilbert space H the following variation norm Carleson theorem:

$$\|S_N f\|_{L^p([0,1);\mathcal{V}^s(H))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p([0,1);H)}, \quad s > 2, \quad s' < p < \infty.$$

This follows for example from Theorem 1.1 although in the special case of a Hilbert space one could just repeat the scalar proof. We first use the reiteration theorem as in [1, Theorem 3.5.3], to write

$$X = [Y, H]_\theta = [[Y, H]_\delta, H]_\omega,$$

with $\theta = (1-\omega)\delta + \omega$. In our considerations one should think of $\delta \to 0$. Now fix $1 < p < \infty$ and interpolate between $L^p([0,1); \ell^\infty([Y, H]_\delta))$ and $L^p([0,1); \mathcal{V}^s(X))$. As in [22, p. 501], we have

$$[\ell^\infty([Y, H]_\delta), \mathcal{V}^s(H)]_\omega \subset \mathcal{V}^{s_\omega}([[Y, H]_\delta, H]_\omega) = \mathcal{V}^{s_\omega}(X),$$

where $\frac{1}{s_\omega} = \frac{1-\omega}{\infty} + \frac{\omega}{s} \Leftrightarrow s_\omega = s/\omega$, and $\theta = (1-\omega)\delta + \omega$. From this we get that

$$\|S_N f\|_{L^p([0,1);\mathcal{V}^r(X))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p([0,1);X)}$$

whenever $r > 2/\theta = q$ and $0 < \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{r'} - \frac{q-2}{2r}$. $\square$

9.1. *Remark.* Let us rephrase Theorem 1.2 for the integrability index p being fixed.

First suppose that $2 < p < \infty$, so we are in the local L^2-case. Then Theorem 1.2 says that the partial sums map $L^p([0,1);X)$ to $L^p(\mathcal{V}^r([0,1);X))$ whenever $r > q$ since, in this case, the condition $\frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{r'} - \frac{q-2}{2r}$ is automatically satisfied. Here Theorem 1.1 gives exactly the same range.

In the case $p < 2$ we get that the partial sums map $L^p([0,1);X)$ to $L^p([0,1);\mathcal{V}^r(X))$ whenever $2r/q > p' \Leftrightarrow r > \frac{q}{2}p'$. This should be contrasted to the weaker statement of Theorem 1.1 which in the case $p < 2$ gives the corresponding result only for the range $r > (q-1)p' > \frac{q}{2}p'$.

References

[1] Jöran Bergh and Jörgen Löfström, *Interpolation spaces. An introduction*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, No. 223. MR0482275 (58 #2349) ↑30

[2] P. Billard, *Sur la convergence presque partout des séries de Fourier-Walsh des fonctions de l'espace* L^2 (0, 1), Studia Math. **28** (1966/1967), 363–388. MR0217510 (36 #599) ↑2

[3] James T. Campbell, Roger L. Jones, Karin Reinhold, and Máté Wierdl, *Oscillation and variation for the Hilbert transform*, Duke Math. J. **105** (2000), no. 1, 59–83. MR1788042 (2001h:42021) ↑1

[4] James T. Campbell, Roger L. Jones, Karin Reinhold, and Máté Wierdl, *Oscillation and variation for singular integrals in higher dimensions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **355** (2003), no. 5, 2115–2137 (electronic). MR1953540 (2003j:44007) ↑2

[5] Lennart Carleson, *On convergence and growth of partial sums of Fourier series*, Acta Math. **116** (1966), 135–157. MR0199631 (33 #7774) ↑1

[6] M. Christ and A. Kiselev, *Scattering and wave operators for one-dimensional Schrödinger operators with slowly decaying nonsmooth potentials*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **12** (2002), no. 6, 1174–1234. MR1952927 (2003m:47019) ↑5

[7] Ciprian Demeter, *Pointwise convergence of the ergodic bilinear Hilbert transform*, Illinois J. Math. **51** (2007), no. 4, 1123–1158. MR2417419 (2009g:47028) ↑5

[8] Ciprian Demeter, Michael T. Lacey, Terence Tao, and Christoph Thiele, *Breaking the duality in the return times theorem*, Duke Math. J. **143** (2008), no. 2, 281–355. MR2420509 (2009f:42013) ↑1, 5

[9] Y. Do, R. Oberlin, and E. A. Palsson, *Variational bounds for a dyadic model of the bilinear Hilbert transform* (2012), available at `arXiv:1203.5135`. ↑5

[10] Yen Do and Michael T. Lacey, *Weighted bounds for variational Walsh-Fourier series* (2011), available at `arXiv:1112.1744`. ↑1, 2, 3, 15, 18

[11] Tuomas P. Hytönen and Michael T. Lacey, *Pointwise convergence of vector-valued Fourier series* (2012), available at `arXiv:1205.0261`. ↑2, 8

[12] Tuomas P. Hytönen and Michael T. Lacey, *Pointwise convergence of Walsh–Fourier series of vector-valued functions* (2012), available at `arXiv:1202.0209`. ↑2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13, 15, 25, 27, 30

[13] Tuomas P. Hytönen, Michael T. Lacey, and Ioannis Parissis, *The vector valued quartile operator* (2012), available at `arXiv:1203.5604`. ↑2, 3

[14] Roger L. Jones, Andreas Seeger, and James Wright, *Strong variational and jump inequalities in harmonic analysis*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **360** (2008), no. 12, 6711–6742. MR2434308 (2010b:42017) ↑2, 5, 15

[15] Michael Lacey and Christoph Thiele, *A proof of boundedness of the Carleson operator*, Math. Res. Lett. **7** (2000), no. 4, 361–370. MR1783613 (2001m:42009) ↑3

[16] D. Lépingle, *La variation d'ordre p des semi-martingales*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete **36** (1976), no. 4, 295–316. MR0420837 (54 #8849) ↑15

[17] R. Oberlin, *Bounds on the walsh model for M^{q,*} Carleson and related operators* (2011), available at `arXiv:1110.1067`. ↑5

[18] R. Oberlin, *Estimates for compositions of maximal operators with singular integrals* (2011), available at `arXiv:1110.1070`. ↑5

[19] Richard Oberlin, Andreas Seeger, Terence Tao, Christoph Thiele, and James Wright, *A variation norm Carleson theorem*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **14** (2012), no. 2, 421–464. MR2881301 ↑1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 15

[20] Javier Parcet, Fernando Soria, and Quanhua Xu, *On the growth of vector-valued Fourier series* (2011), available at `arXiv:1109.4313`. ↑2

[21] Gilles Pisier, *Martingales with values in uniformly convex spaces*, Israel J. Math. **20** (1975), no. 3-4, 326–350. MR0394135 (52 #14940) ↑14, 15

[22] Gilles Pisier and Quan Hua Xu, *The strong p-variation of martingales and orthogonal series*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **77** (1988), no. 4, 497–514. MR933985 (89d:60086) ↑15, 30

[23] José L. Rubio de Francia, *Fourier series and Hilbert transforms with values in UMD Banach spaces*, Studia Math. **81** (1985), no. 1, 95–105. MR818174 (87d:42008) ↑2

[24] José L. Rubio de Francia, *Martingale and integral transforms of Banach space valued functions*, Probability and Banach spaces (Zaragoza, 1985), 1986, pp. 195–222. MR875011 (88g:42020) ↑2

[25] Prabatha Silva, *Vector valued inequalities for familes of bilinear Hilbert transform and applications to bi-parameter problems* (2012). arXiv:1203.3251v1. ↑3

[26] Christoph Thiele, *Wave packet analysis*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 105, Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 2006. MR2199086 (2006m:42073) ↑15, 16

[27] F. Weisz, *Almost everywhere convergence of Banach space-valued Vilenkin-Fourier series*, Acta Math. Hungar. **116** (2007), no. 1-2, 47–59. MR2341038 (2008h:42055) ↑2

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, P.O.B. 68 (GUSTAF HÄLLSTRÖMIN KATU 2B), FI-00014 UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, FINLAND

E-mail address: `tuomas.hytonen@helsinki.fi`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ATLANTA GA 30332

E-mail address: `lacey@math.gatech.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, P.O.B 11100 (OTAKAARI 1 M), FI-00076 AALTO UNIVERSITY, FINLAND

E-mail address: `ioannis.parissis@gmail.com`